



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,488	11/02/2001	Tyler J. McKinley	P0487	3362

23735

7590

12/30/2008

DIGIMARC CORPORATION
9405 SW GEMINI DRIVE
BEAVERTON, OR 97008

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2008

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)	Application No. 10/053,488	Applicant(s) MCKINLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Wenpeng Chen	Art Unit 2624	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 07 July 2008 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.
EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☐ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☐ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

See Continuation Sheet.

/Wenpeng Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Continuation of 10. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): In MPEP 1205 (vii) Argument, it requires that "Each ground of rejection must be treated under a separate heading." In the present Appeal Brief, there are five (5) grounds of rejection under appeal:

- (1) Claims 4, 18-19, 23-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081);
- (2) Claims 4, 18-24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081);
- (3) Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081);
- (4) Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081) in view of Hawkins et al. (US patent 6,389,421);
- (5) Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinoda (US 6,611,830) in view of Vynne et al. (US patent 5,960,081).

However, in the present Appeal Brief, there are only four (4) headings. The above-listed grounds of rejection (1) and (2) are under the same heading. The heading "Claim 2 is patentable over Hawkins" does not reflect the above-listed ground of rejection (4). It is obviously shown in the Final Rejection that how the Examiner read the teachings of Vynne for ground of rejection (1) is different from that of ground of rejection (2) and the teachings of Vynne for ground of rejection (3) is different from that of ground of rejection (4).